

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

James Paul Aery,

Civ. No. 21-2375 (KMM/BRT)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

Joshua Arhart,

Defendant.

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff James Paul Aery’s motion for an emergency injunction filed on July 18, 2022.¹ (Doc. No. 39.) Plaintiff asks the Court to “arrange for sufficient resources” to cover the costs of his litigation, including phone calls and envelopes. (*Id.*) While the Court has granted Plaintiff permission to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”), “nothing in the IFP statute requires the Court to pay a party’s discovery costs.” *Janetta v. Minnesota Dep’t of Hum. Servs.*, No. 19-CV-2622 (ECT/TNL), 2020 WL 4593816, at *1 (D. Minn. Aug. 11, 2020); *see also Lightfeather v. Osborn*, No. 4:20CV3118, 2021 WL 107141, at *3 (D. Neb. Jan. 12, 2021) (“[T]he statutory right to proceed in forma pauperis does not include the right to receive funds from the court to pay discovery or other costs relating to a pro se litigant’s case.”); *Haymes v. Smith*, 73

¹ The Court notes that Plaintiff has filed this exact motion in several other of his cases pending in this district. *See Aery v. Lewis*, No. 22-CV-12 (KMM/BRT) (D. Minn. July 18, 2022) (Doc. No. 31); *Aery v. Unknown Actors in the Employ of Beltrami County Jail*, No. 21-CV-2422 (PJS/JFD) (D. Minn. July 18, 2022) (Doc. No. 33); *Aery v. Beitel*, No. 22-CV-114 (KMM/TNL) (D. Minn. July 18, 2022) (Doc. No. 16); *Aery v. Nohre*, No. 22-CV-491 (PJS/TNL) (D. Minn. July 18, 2022) (Doc. No. 30).

F.R.D. 572, 574 (W.D.N.Y. 1976) (“The generally recognized rule is that a court may not authorize the commitment of federal funds to underwrite the necessary expenditures of an indigent civil litigant’s action.”) (citing *Tyler v. Lark*, 472 F.2d 1077 (8th Cir. 1973)).

Accordingly, Plaintiff’s injunctive request that the Court finance the costs of his litigation is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 20, 2022

s/ Becky R. Thorson
BECKY R. THORSON
United States Magistrate Judge